

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 11-13, 15, 17, 20 and 22 are pending in the present application. Claims 11, 17, and 22 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-10, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 21 have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 11, 13, 17, and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 11-13, 15, 17, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,252,835 (Choi et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,457,587 (Suzuki et al.). Claims 11-13, 15, 17, 20, and 22 were alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,600,615 (Kiyoura et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 11 now recites, inter alia, an offset measuring unit which measures offset parameters, which are composed of a sum signal, a position adjustment value of a focus lens, a constant linear velocity (CLV) adjustment value, and a variation adjustment value of an optical disc, the sum signal being a sum of a plurality of signals which are detected from the optical disc using a photo diode (PD) in an optical pickup of the DVD player, the focus lens being included in the optical pickup, and the CLV adjustment value being used to rotate the optical disc for initial reproducing operations of a DVD player.

Independent claims 17 and 22 now recite, inter alia, measuring an offset parameters of a sum signal, a position adjustment value of a focus lens, a constant linear velocity (CLV) adjustment value, and a variation adjustment value of an optical disc, the sum signal being a sum of a plurality of signals which are detected from the optical disc using a photo diode (PD) in an optical pickup of the DVD player, the focus lens being included in the optical pickup, and the CLV adjustment value being used to rotate the optical disc for initial reproducing operations of a DVD player.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features. Thus, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combinations, it is respectfully submitted that the asserted

combinations are likewise deficient, even in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Office Action contends that the microcomputer 507 of Choi is an offset measuring unit. (Office Action, page 3). Thus, to meet the aforementioned features of amended independent claims 11, 17, and 22 the microcomputer 507 must meet the aforementioned features. Applicant submits that it does not.

The Office Action appears to contend that the microcomputer 507 measures various parameters, but only provides support for the contention that the microcomputer measures a sum signal. (Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully submit that microcomputer 507 of Choi does not measure the offset parameters as they are defined by amended independent claims 11, 17, and 22.

Indeed, a review of FIG. 5 of Choi reveals that the microcomputer 507 receives only the following three signals:

- (1) error signal f_0 from phase comparator 506;
- (2) initial focus offset value f_i from memory 508; and
- (3) level of focus error signal f_2 from level detector 509.

Firstly, Choi expressly teaches that signal f_0 is an error signal that provides a “phase difference value.” (Choi, Col. 4, lines 32-35). This is not surprising since signal f_0 is output by phase comparator 506. Further, Choi expressly teaches that signal f_0 from the phase comparator 506 is based on a comparison of a signal from signal separator 505 with a reference voltage and that the signal from the signal separator is “only a 3T signal.” (Choi, Col. 4, lines 23-26). In other words, Choi teaches that signal f_0 is phase difference value based on a comparison result of a separated 3T signal with a reference voltage. Thus, the signal f_0 cannot be a sum signal. And, since the microcomputer does not receive the sum signal, it does not measure it.

Regarding the other offset parameters, it is noted that the Office does not identify any support for the implicit, generic allegation that Choi teaches that the microcomputer 507 measures any of these parameters. (Office Action, page 3). Further, Applicants submit that Choi is silent as to such features. Indeed, the microcomputer 507 of Choi is expressly taught to receive only three signals, not four. (Choi, FIG. 5). Thus, even assuming arguendo that error signal f_0 somehow “already contains a sum signal” (Office Action, page 8), the microcomputer still does not measure all four recited offset parameters. For example, one of the three signal

received by the microcomputer 507, signal f_i , is expressly defined as a stored initial offset focus value. (Choi, Col. 4, lines 59-61). Thus it is not measured.

The secondary citation to Suzuki relates to a method and system for correcting an offset of a head position signal and is cited for its alleged disclosure of re-measuring newly-measured offset values during a subsequent initial reproduction. Applicant respectfully submits that Suzuki does not add anything that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency of Choi. Thus, this combination is deficient and the Office has not established a prima facie case of obviousness.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Regarding the alternate secondary citation to Kiyoura et al., that patent relates to a device and method for automatically controlling a servo loop gain and is cited for its alleged disclosure of re-measuring newly-measured offset values during a subsequent initial reproduction. Applicant respectfully submits that Kiyoura et al. does not add anything that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency of Choi. Thus, this combination is also deficient.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.


There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 23, 2007

By: 
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501